DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 005 EC 100 554

AUTHOR Michael, John A.
TITLE Summer 1975 Program for Deaf Children. Evaluation Period July 1 - August 8, 1975.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aurally Handicapped; Bilingualism; *Deaf; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; Individualized Programs; *Mathematics; *Program Evaluation; *Reading; Remedial Instruction; Statistical Data; *Summer Programs

ABSTRACT

A summer program aimed at mastery of instructional objectives in reading and mathematics was provided for 110 deaf children (5-14 years old), many of whom were from non-English speaking or bilingual homes. Participants were administered, as a pretest, selected criterion-referenced tests from the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks (Reading) and the BASE (Math) Systems to ascertain individual instructional objectives for each student. Findings showed that learning was nearly universal, with many profoundly handicapped children mastering an impressive number of instructional objectives; that the summer program was not a reiteration of previously mastered curriculum; and that there were no major departures from the program design. (Provided are tables with statistical data and sample information forms.) (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138005

EVALUATION REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

B/E #09-61605

Summer 1975 Program for Deaf Children

Evaluation Period
July 1 - August 8, 1975

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Consultant/Evaluator
Dr. John A. Michael

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the Summer 1975.

EC100 554

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I. Program Description	1
Chapter II. Evaluation Procedures	1
General Program Objective	1
Evaluation Objective #1	1
Subjects	2
Methods and Procedures	2
Time Schedule	2
Data Analysis	2
Evaluation Objective #2	3
Subjects	3
Methods and Procedure	3
Time Schedule	3
Data Analysis	3
Evaluation Objective #3	3
Data Loss	4
Methodological Limitations	4
Chapter III. Findings	4
Objective #1	4
Objective #2	5
Program Adequacy	7
Prior Recommendations	7
Objective #3	7
Chapter IV. Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	9
Summary	9
Conclusion	10
Recommendations	10

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table "A"	Distribution of pupil non-mastery on pretest and no post-test follow-up	11
Table "B"	Distribution of pupil mastery of instructional objectives prior to instruction	11
Table "C"	Distribution of pupil mastery by instructional objectives as a result of instruction	12
Table "D"	Distribution of the number of instructional objectives mastered after instruction	13
Table "E"	Distribution of the percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives	14

Appendixes

Mailed Information Report (MIR)
Data Loss Form

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR DEAF CHILDREN

Chapter I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The program is designed to provide for the education of 110 deaf children many who entered school late. The participants in this program are profoundly deaf from ages 5 to 14. A major portion of these children come from non-English speaking or bilingual homes and need additional assistance in communication skills development. Participants are regarded as educationally disadvantaged in view of their late entrance to school.

The summer program operated for 28 days, four hours each day at the School for the Deaf, JHS-47M. A teacher-in-charge, assisted by a general assistant organized the program, planned orientation sessions and supervised all aspects of the program, employing a staff of 18 teachers, three school aides, three educational assistants and one school secretary. Classes were organized to provide: development of communication skills; learning English as a second language; lip reading; basic language arts; health and physical education development, cultural enrichment; arts and crafts activities relating to reading and mathematics skills development.

Chapter II. EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

General Program Objective: To help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading and mathematics which they fail prior to instruction as measured bythe Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks (Reading) and the BASE (Mathematics) criterion referenced tests.

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master.

Subjects: All participants in the program.

Methods and Procedures: Pupils were assigned to classes on the basis of school records and teacher judgment. The Santa Clara was used as a leveler to determine instructional level, in the absence of standardized test data. Repeated failure on an item indicated a child's level. All participants were administered, as a pretest, selected criterion-referenced tests from the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks (Reading) and the BASE (Math) Systems to ascertain individual instructional objectives for each pupil. For each instructional objective diagnosed as requiring remediation (as determined by pretest failure), a post-test was administered on an individual basis after an appropriate interval of instruction. For each instructional objective, results of passing and failing on both the pretest and the post-test should be recorded on the Class Evaluation Record (C.E.R.). */

Time Schedule: The pretest was administered at the beginning of the program; the post-test at appropriate intervals throughout the life of the program.

Data Analysis: Data were analyzed and presented in tabular form ascertaining the percentage of participants demonstrating mastery or non-mastery of each instructional objective (according to SED classification system) at initial testing, and final testing.

---

*/ The terms pretest and post-test when used in the context of an evaluation based upon a criterion-referenced instrument are interchangeable with the terms entry test and mastery test.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

Subjects: Same as above.

Methods and Procedures: Same as above.

Time Schedule: Same as above.

Data Analysis: Data were analyzed and presented in narrative and tabular form to ascertain each of the following. Tables are appended.

A. The distribution of pupils failing to demonstrate mastery prior to instruction and not receiving sufficient instruction to receive the post-test.

B. The distribution of pupils demonstrating mastery of objectives prior to instruction.

C. The distribution of pupil mastery as a result of instruction by instructional objectives.

D. The distribution of the number of objectives mastered as a result of instruction.

E. The distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Data Loss

The analysis excludes two pupils who attended only one half-day session. For the tally of children on Santa Clara developmental tasks, see the next paragraph.

Methodological Limitations

Developmental tasks under the Santa Clara are not readily mapped into the State-designated classification of reading and math activities. In some instances the Santa Clara developmental tasks (e.g., the ability to creep, walk, run) resemble no reading or math category in the State schema, and hence data on these tasks have been shown separately. In many instances, mapping was possible. Accordingly, the Santa Clara results are presented under the appropriate reading or math category.

For 80 children, all Santa Clara tasks have been completely remapped. The total for Santa Clara developmental tasks is reduced accordingly to 42.

Chapter III. FINDINGS

Objective #1: Did 70 percent of the pupils master at least one instructional objective during the program? Table "D" (appended) presents evidence in the affirmative. Fully 98% and 99% of the student body mastered one or more instructional objective during the program's course in reading and math respectively. Indeed the average child mastered approximately eight objectives in each area. In addition, 34% of the student body (42 pupils) mastered one or more developmental tasks relevant to academic achievement during the program, at an average rate of three tasks per child. In short, learning was nearly universal, with many profoundly handicapped children mastering an impressive number of instructional objectives.

These results are not surprising. Observation shows the staff undertook instruction from the very beginning and continued in earnest throughout the program's duration. Also from observation, it can be reported that the program administration encouraged teachers to give children a sense of accomplishment by passing post-tests.

Objective #2: To what extent did pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives as a result of participation in the program? Addressing this question with evidence beyond that already presented, we need to consider several issues:

(a) to what extent did a demonstrated lack of mastery continue unchanged throughout the program?

(b) to what extent did the program dwell on familiar territory on which pupils had already gained mastery?

(c) to what extent were the gains in learning patterned by subject matter?

and (d) to what extent were pupils likely to succeed in mastering the objectives they undertook?

Evidence on these issues follows.

(a) The extent of unattained objectives. Only 4% of the student body failed a reading item at the pretest and subsequently did not master the instructional objective by program's end. Similarly, in math, fully 97% of the pupils failing a pretest item subsequently mastered the instructional objective. Virtually all of the Santa Clara developmental tasks reported separately from the reading and math which were initially failed were later passed. Table "A" presents the details.

Several factors account for this widespread achievement. Teachers were encouraged to set instructional objectives realistically, in light of the children's capabilities and the summer's time constraints. Moreover special efforts were made by this hard-working dedicated staff to have each child accomplish his/her objective(s).

(b) The extent of fresh instructional objectives. Table "B" shows how often pupils demonstrated mastery prior to the program, expressed as a percentage of all pretest attempts. In both reading and math, nearly all students in the program failed at least three out of every four instructional objectives attempted. In reading, for example, 96% of the student body demonstrated mastery of instructional objectives prior to instruction 25% of the time or less. The comparable statistic for math is 97%. Only in the developmental tasks was there a higher rate of initial success: 73% of the students in the program successfully completed better than three out of four tasks prior to instruction.

The significantly better showing on the Santa Clara developmental tasks is due to classification of the more difficult developmental tasks under the appropriate reading or math activities, using the State-approved classification schema. This operation left the comparatively easier tasks (e.g., ability to run or hop) in the category of developmental tasks. As Table "B" shows, even these proved difficult for a number of pupils in this profoundly handicapped population.

In short, the summer's program was not a reiteration of previously mastered curriculum.

(c) Variability in learning by subject matter. Table "C" reinforces the interpretation placed on Table "A", viz. nearly universal achievement On one instructional objective after another, all or nearly all youth who attempted the objective ultimately attained it. The most difficult objective, classification, foiled only 11% of the pupils attempting it.

(d) The likelihood of scholastic success. Table "E" shows the number of instructional objectives each child mastered as a percentage of all he (or she) undertook during the summer program. In both reading and math, a

very high proportion of the population (94% and 97% respectively) attained mastery 90-100% of the time. By contrast, only one program enrollee failed to master a single math or reading objective. Yet that same youngster did attempt and master four developmental tasks. In fact, as Table "E" shows, pupils in the program invariably accomplished the developmental tasks which had been set out for them. In short, the program spawned achievement, not pointless frustration, an interpretation corraborated by classroom observation.

Program Adequacy

The materials and facilities used by the program were adequate. The pupils and staff persisted admirably in the face of building renovation, which caused noise and grit as well as dislocated the program's administrative personnel.

On the basis of the evidence supplied above and on-the-scene observations, the program is servicing the needs of the specific target population for which it was designed. This is a crucial consideration in deciding whether to continue the program, since many parties -- the children's families included -- are limited in their ability to meet the special needs of this population.

Prior Recommendations

In evaluating the 1974 Summer Program, Dr. Merrill T. Hollinshead had recommended increasing staff for classes of deaf pupils with intellectual limitations. Implementing the suggestion, a class was established for retarded (CRMD) youngsters, staffed by a specialist in that field.

Objective #3: To what extent did the actual program coincide with the proposal design? There were no major departures from the program design. Several minor variations should be mentioned, however. Also difficulties

encountered in the implementation of the design are reported below.

The program design required the use of the results of a May, 1975 Title I city-wide test as a "leveler", i.e., as a basis for grouping children into instructional groups. Children at the School for the Deaf were not administered such a test. Hence classroom assignments were based on school records, teacher judgment, and the children's performance on the Santa Clara Inventory of Developmental Tasks. Repeated failure on a test item established a child's instructional level. This test usage registered substantial pupil "mastery" on developmental tasks initially. The frequency with which mastery was observed (Table B) reflects this use of the Santa Clara rather than a tendency on the part of the staff to reiterate curriculum.

The design structured partially incompatible requirements. The results of the Santa Clara are not always readily transcribed into the State-approved classification of reading and math activities. During the summer, teachers used two scoring schemas, recording their activities sometimes in terms of the Santa Clara recording schema and at other times in terms of the State-approved system. Where possible, activities recorded under the Santa Clara system have been reclassified by the evaluator to conform to the State classification schema. As this was not always possible, a residue of Santa Clara items have been reported in the tables and MIR Section III, Item 30.

The required heading in Table "A" ("Number of Instructional Objectives Failed") was amended by adding "Without Follow-Up". The statistic refers not to pretest failure alone, but to pretest failure with a post-test follow-up.

Finally several minor difficulties in test administration and data collection were encountered in the shift to a new type of test, i.e., criterion referenced testing. For one thing, the method of recording post-test results used by the program departed somewhat from the official Class Evaluation Record schema, in that no symbol was used to signify post-test or post-test failure. Thus an "E" on the program's records might reflect either no post-test or post-test failure. The effect of this recording error upon the data is to understate the apparent amount of instruction taking place during the summer in Table "A".

Some confusion resulted from the adoption of a new type of test. Teachers struggled with the tendency of criterion-referenced tests to direct the path of instruction, as opposed to adopting test-items that fit a preconceived course of instruction. Maintaining a new recording system on a daily basis throughout the program's duration constituted a sizeable clerical task, especially for teachers who individuate their instructional objectives. Finally, the evaluator did not participate in the initial orientation to the new tests and their administration. Consequently he was of minimal assistance to teachers and the program coordinator when questions about the initial guidance arose.

Many of these difficulties could be avoided by a careful review of testing materials and recording devices by the evaluator and program administrator in pre-program conferences before personnel training.

Chapter IV. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The summer program serves a population which generally has few, if any, options for development-conducive activities during the summer. In seeking to advance this handicapped population's cognitive development, many more

than 70% (Objective #1) attained one instructional objective. Indeed, the average pupil attained nearly eight instructional items in reading and math each. In short, learning was widespread (Objective #2).

The program was instituted as written (Objective #3) with but minor exception. However the adoption of criterion-referenced testing complicated the program's implementation and evaluation.

Conclusion

The data give the clear impression that this program advances the cognitive growth of handicapped youngsters.

Recommendations

The program should definitely be continued. This recommendation is predicated on the demonstrated progress of students over the summer and on the basis of the lack of meaningful summertime options for deaf children. The costs of this program are small compared to the long-run costs that would be exacted by failure to develop deaf children into economically productive adults.

As for program evaluation, instruments should be selected in conjunction with the development of other program components. Where a new mode of testing is adopted, as in the present instance, the evaluator should participate in pre-program conferences and any workshops on test administration, so as to assist the program coordinator and other program personnel in the design and performance of their test-administration responsibilities.

TABLE "A"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRETEST AND NO POST-TEST FOLLOW-UP

Number of Instructional Objectives Without Follow-Up	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Reading:		
3-4	1	1
1-2	4	3
None	117	96
	122	100
Math:		
1-2	4	3
None	118	97
	122	100
Developmental Tasks:		
None	122	100

TABLE "B"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Reading:		
76-100%	0	0
51- 75%	2	2
26- 50%	2	2
0- 25%	118	96
	122	100
Math:		
76-100%	0	0
51- 75%	1	1
26- 50%	3	2
0- 25%	118	97
	122	100
Developmental Tasks:		
76-100%	31	73
51- 75%	3	8
26- 50%	8	19
0- 25%	0	0
	42	100

TABLE "C"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objective	Ratio of # pupils achieving mastery / # pupils attempting mastery	Percentage of of Mastery
Math:		
1101	377/378	100
1102	17/17	100
1103	7/7	100
1107	83/83	100
1108	27/27	100
1109	39/39	100
1110	4/4	100
1205	57/57	100
1301	30/30	100
1305	28/29	97
1306	22/22	100
1601	179/179	100
1602	48/50	96
1603	10/10	100
Reading:		
2101	268/268	100
2102	43/43	100
2104	11/11	100
2105	6/6	100
2110	16/16	100
2203	5/5	100
2204	6/6	100
2207	24/24	100
2301	33/33	100
2305	35/35	100
2402	42/47	89
2404	60/60	100
2405	42/42	100
2406	16/16	100
2407	137/137	100
2408	5/5	100
2409	103/104	99
2413	12/12	100
Developmental Tasks:		
Motor Coordination	11/11	100
Visual Motor	8/8	100
Visual Perception	14/14	100
Visual Memory	17/17	100
Auditory Perception	25/25	100
Auditory Memory	16/16	100
Language Development	26/26	100
Conceptual Development	15/15	100

TABLE "D"

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Reading:		
None	3	2
1-2	7	6
3-4	15	12
5-6	22	18
7-8	41	34
9-10	22	18
11-12	5	4
13-14	1	1
15-16	0	0
17-18	6	5
	122	100
Math:		
None	1	1
1-2	14	6
3-4	3	3
5-6	21	18
7-8	35	30
9-10	24	21
11-12	12	10
13-14	5	4
15-16	3	3
17-18	1	1
19-20	0	0
21-22	3	3
	122	100
Developmental Tasks:		
None	None	None
1-2	13	31
3-4	19	45
5-6	4	10
7-8	6	14
	42	100

TABLE "E"

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (# Objectives Achieved) / (# Objectives Attempted)	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Reading:		
90-100%	116	94
80-89 %	2	2
70-79 %	1	1
60-69 %	1	1
50-59 %	1	1
40-49 %		
30-39 %		
20-29 %		
10-19 %		
0-9 %	1	1
	122	100
Math:		
90-100%	119	97
80-89 %	1	1
70-79 %		
60-69 %	1	1
50-59 %		
40-49 %		
30-39 %		
20-29 %		
10-19 %		
0-9 %	1	1
	122	100
Developmental Tasks:		
90-100%	42	100
80-89 %		
70-79 %		
60-69 %		
50-59 %		
40-49 %		
30-39 %		
20-29 %		
10-19 %		
0-9 %		
	42	100

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12224

SKILLED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION III

1974-75 School Year

Due Date: July 15, 1975

SED Project Number | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 5 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |

BS Function Number (N.Y.C. only) | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 |

Project Title Summer 1975 Program for Deaf Children

School District Name DSEPPS - District 75

School District Address 110 Livingston Street

Brooklyn, New York 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Dr. John A. Michael

Title Evaluator

Telephone Number 212 301 873-7058 656-5811
(Area Code)

Date this form was completed 8 / 8 / 75

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
1101	Pre-operational	Base (73)	Elem.*	60911	H	0	7	*	0
1301	Non-std. measures	"	"	"	"	0	7	7	0
1101	Pre-operational	"	"	60913	"	0	216	216	0
1107	Addition	"	"	"	"	0	16	16	0
1108	Substraction	"	"	"	"	0	12	12	0
1205	Polgons	"	"	"	"	0	38	38	0
1301	Non-std. measures	"	"	"	"	0	15	15	0
1305	Monetary system	"	"	"	"	0	13	13	0
1306	Time	"	"	"	"	0	7	7	0
1601	Sets: identification	"	"	"	"	0	114	114	0
1602	Empty set	"	"	"	"	0	41	39	2
1603	Matching sets	"	"	"	"	0	10	10	0
1101	Pre-operational	"	"	60914	"	8	155	154	1
1102	Whole numbers	"	"	"	"	0	17	17	0
1103	Fractions	"	"	"	"	0	7	7	0
1107	Addition	"	"	"	"	8	67	67	0

*/ The test publishers recommend the use of the 1973 version of BASE for the elementary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
1108	Subtraction	Base (73)	Elem.*	60914	H	0	15	15	0
1109	Multiplication					2	39	39	0
1110	Division					0	4	4	0
1205	Polygons					0	19	19	0
1301	Non-std. measures					0	8	8	0
1305	Monetary system					0	16	15	1
1306	Time					0	15	15	0
1601	Sets: identification					0	65	65	0
1602	Empty set					0	9	9	0

*/ The test publishers recommend the use of the 1973 version of BASE for the elementary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2402	Classifying	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	60811	H	16	18	13	5
2405	Following direction	"	"	"	"	4	3	3	0
2101	Letter recognition	"	"	60813	"	0	118	118	0
2102	Initial consonants	"	"	"	"	0	15	15	0
2104	Final consonants	"	"	"	"	0	3	3	0
2203	Endings	"	"	"	"	0	5	5	0
2301	Antonyms	"	"	"	"	0	20	20	0
2305	Word meaning	"	"	"	"	0	35	35	0
2402	Classifying	"	"	"	"	1	17	17	0
2404	Facts-details	"	"	"	"	0	19	19	0
2405	Follow directions	"	"	"	"	0	15	15	0
2406	Main ideas	"	"	"	"	0	16	16	0
2407	Picture clues	"	"	"	"	0	99	99	0
2409	Sequence	"	"	"	"	0	64	64	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2101	Letter recognition	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	60814	H	3	150	149	1
2102	Initial consonants	"	"	"	"	0	28	28	0
2104	Final consonants	"	"	"	"	0	8	8	0
2105	Consonants blends	"	"	"	"	0	6	6	0
2110	Rhyming words	"	"	"	"	0	16	16	0
2204	Prefixes	"	"	"	"	0	6	6	0
2207	Sentence structures	"	"	"	"	0	24	24	0
2301	Antonyms	"	"	"	"	0	13	13	0
2402	Classifying	"	"	"	"	0	12	12	0
2404	Facts-details	"	"	"	"	0	41	41	0
2405	Follow directions	"	"	"	"	0	24	24	0
2407	Picture clues	"	"	"	"	0	38	38	0
2408	Drawing conclusions	"	"	"	"	0	5	5	0
2409	Sequence	"	"	"	"	0	40	39	1
2413	Inference	"	"	"	"	0	12	12	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
1-2	walk	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69911	H	0	5	5	0
1-3	run	"	"	"	"	4	2	2	0
2-2	follow target	"	"	"	"	0	4	4	0
2-3	string beads	"	"	"	"	1	3	3	0
2-4	copy circle	"	"	"	"	6	0	0	0
3-4	match forms	"	"	"	"	0	6	6	0
5-7	locate sound	"	"	"	"	0	3	3	0
5-8	match beginning sound	"	"	"	"	0	3	3	0
1-4	jump rope	"	"	69913	"	3	0	0	0
1-6	balance	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
1-8	skip	"	"	"	"	3	0	0	0
1-9	balance	"	"	"	"	5	0	0	0
1-10	jump rope	"	"	"	"	11	0	0	0
1-11	jump rope	"	"	"	"	26	1	1	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2-4	copy circle	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69913	H	2	0	0	0
2-5	copy cross	"	"	"	"	2	0	0	0
2-6	copy square	"	"	"	"	2	0	0	0
2-7	cut	"	"	"	"	5	0	0	0
2-8	tie shoes	"	"	"	"	3	0	0	0
2-9	copy letters	"	"	"	"	4	0	0	0
2-10	copy sentence	"	"	"	"	7	1	1	0
2-11	copy diamond	"	"	"	"	24	0	0	0
3-3	match colors	"	"	"	"	2	0	0	0
3-4	match forms	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
3-5	match size	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
3-7	match numbers	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
3-8	match letters	"	"	"	"	7	0	0	0
3-9	match directions	"	"	"	"	6	0	0	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
3-10	match images	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69913	H	7	0	0	0
3-11	match words	"	"	"	"	21	0	0	0
4-4	recall animals	"	"	"	"	2	3	3	0
4-5	memory recall	"	"	"	"	2	1	1	0
4-6	recall color	"	"	"	"	6	1	1	0
4-7	recall in sequence	"	"	"	"	4	1	1	0
4-8	reproduce design	"	"	"	"	5	0	0	0
4-9	recall sequence	"	"	"	"	11	0	0	0
4-10	recall design	"	"	"	"	6	0	0	0
4-11	recall words	"	"	"	"	7	0	0	0
5-5	discriminate sounds	"	"	"	"	12	0	0	0
5-6	identify sounds	"	"	"	"	3	0	0	0
5-7	locate sound	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
5-8	match beginning	"	"	"	"	4	0	0	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
5-10	match rhymes	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69913	H	1	0	0	0
6-6	do 3 tasks	"	"	"	"	7	1	1	0
6-7	repeat sentence	"	"	"	"	1	1	1	0
6-8	repeat tapping	"	"	"	"	7	2	2	0
7-7	give information	"	"	"	"	8	1	1	0
7-8	describe subjects	"	"	"	"	8	2	2	0
7-9	relate words to pictures	"	"	"	"	0	2	2	0
8-8	assign value	"	"	"	"	15	0	0	0
8-9	identify position	"	"	"	"	10	0	0	0
1-4	jump	"		69914	"	1	0	0	0
1-6	balance	"	"	"	"	4	0	0	0
1-7	use arms & hands	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
1-8	skip	"	"	"	"	5	0	0	0
1-9	balance	"	"	"	"	3	2	2	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
1-10	jump rope	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69914	H	5	0	0	0
1-11	jump rope	"	"	"	"	41	1	1	0
2-6	copy square	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
2-8	tie shoes	"	"	"	"	8	0	0	0
2-9	copy letters	"	"	"	"	4	0	0	0
2-10	copy sentence	"	"	"	"	3	0	0	0
2-11	copy diamond	"	"	"	"	46	0	0	0
3-3	match colors	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
3-4	match colors	"	"	"	"	0	1	1	0
3-6	match size & form	"	"	"	"	7	2	2	0
3-7	match numbers	"	"	"	"	2	4	4	0
3-8	match letters	"	"	"	"	6	0	0	0
3-9	match directions	"	"	"	"	0	1	1	0
3-10	isolate images	"	"	"	"	10	0	0	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
3-11	match words	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69914	H	35	0	0	0
4-4	recall animals	"	"	"	"	0	4	4	0
4-5	name from memory	"	"	"	"	3	6	6	0
4-6	recall color	"	"	"	"	3	1	1	0
4-7	recall in sequence	"	"	"	"	9	0	0	0
4-8	reproduce design	"	"	"	"	4	0	0	0
4-9	recall sequence	"	"	"	"	10	0	0	0
4-10	recall design	"	"	"	"	8	0	0	0
4-11	recall words	"	"	"	"	18	0	0	0
5-5	discriminate sounds	"	"	"	"	7	17	17	0
5-6	identify sound	"	"	"	"	5	2	2	0
5-7	locate sound	"	"	"	"	2	0	0	0
5-8	match beginning	"	"	"	"	3	0	0	0
6-6	do 3 tasks	"	"	"	"	4	10	10	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
6-7	repeat sentence	Santa Clara (74)	Ungraded*	69914	H	2	2	2	0
6-8	repeat tapping	"	"	"	"	8	0	0	0
6-9	repeat numbers	"	"	"	"	2	3	3	0
6-10	recall story	"	"	"	"	1	0	0	0
6-11	repeat 5 numbers	"	"	"	"	2	0	0	0
7-7	give information	"	"	"	"	13	13	13	0
7-8	describe subjects	"	"	"	"	6	3	3	0
7-9	relate words to picture	"	"	"	"	5	6	6	0
7-10	define words	"	"	"	"	2	1	1	0
8-8	assign value	"	"	"	"	4	10	10	0
8-9	identify position	"	"	"	"	2	1	1	0
8-10	identify similarity	"	"	"	"	4	3	3	0
8-11	sort objects	"	"	"	"	0	1	1	0

*/ The test publisher recommends the instrument be used for children of preschool age through most of the primary years.

B/E #09-61605

32. Program Abstract: Please provide an abstract of your project, including aspects of the project which account for highly positive results. Provide a summary of the findings in relation to the objectives, as well as a description of the pedagogical methodology employed.

33. Date activities began 7 / 1 /75 (Mo. Day Yr.) Date activities will terminate 8 / 8 /75 (Mo. Day Yr.)

34. Project time span (check one): 1[ ] School Year 2[X] Summer 3[ ] 12 Mos. 4[ ] More than 1 year

35. Project is: 1[ ] New 2[X] Resubmitted 3[ ] Continuation (Title III only)

A. If project is resubmitted, please indicate number of years operated:

[ ] 2 years [ ] 4 years

[ ] 3 years [X] 5 or more years

66803

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function #09-61605

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 1	7 2 0	pre-K	Santa Clara (74)	8	7	1	12	Attended only one session	1
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 0	1-3	"	52	51	1	2	Attended only one session	1
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	4-6	"	64	64	0	0		
6 0 9 1 1	7 2 0	Pre-K	Base (73)	8	7	1	12	Attended only one session	1
6 0 9 1 3	7 2 0	1-3		52	51	1	2	Attended only one session	1
6 0 9 1 4	7 2 0	4-6	"	64	64	0	0		

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-61605

In this table enter all data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 9 9 1 1	7 2 0	pre-K	Santa Clara (74)	8	7	1	12	Attended only one session	1
6 9 9 1 3	7 2 0	1-3	"	52	51	1	2	Attended only one session	1
6 9 9 1 4	7 2 0	4-6	"	64	64	0	0		

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.